

## **REMARKS**

Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering the present application. In addition, Applicants also thank Examiner for taking time to discuss claims 1 and 21 of the present application with Applicants' representative in the Examiner Interview of January 11, 2007.

Claims 1-82 are currently pending. By way of this reply, claims 1, 21, 28, 30, 35, 41, 46, 52-63 and 76 have been amended.

### **Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 112**

In the 5th paragraph of the final Office action, Examiner rejects claims 35 and 46 under 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Particularly, Examiner indicated that in the limitation "wherein corresponding includes corresponding according to an analyzing strategy," it is unclear as to what the corresponding is referring to.

Claim 35 is amended to now recite "The method of Claim 30, wherein locating a reference datum in the reference database corresponding to the structured datum comprises locating the reference datum in the reference database corresponding to the structured datum according to an analyzing strategy." Claim 46 is amended to now recite "The method of Claim 41, wherein means for locating a reference datum in the reference database corresponding to the structured datum comprises means for locating the reference datum in the reference database corresponding to the structured datum according to an analyzing strategy." Therefore, it is clear in amended claims 35 and 46 as to what the corresponding is referring to. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 112 rejections is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants note changes in claims 1 and 63 to recite “a reference datum,” which is a synonymous replacement of “at least one reference datum,” and “a structured datum,” which is a synonymous replacement of “at least one structured datum.” These changes are not to be considered narrowing amendments, but rather amendments to ease readability of the claims.

**Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(b) in View of Walker**

In the 6th paragraph of the Office action, Examiner rejects claims 1-15, 17-38, 41-49, 52-60, 62-77, and 79-82 under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by EPO Publication No. WO 01/86390 by Walker et al. (“Walker”). For the reasons set forth below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Representative independent claim 21 as amended specifically recites, *inter alia*, the following:

augmenting the source data file **at a first instance**,

...

transmitting the augmented data file to a computing device;

receiving an identifier **at a second instance** from the computing device corresponding to a pointer being positioned over the structured datum in the computing device;

responsive to receiving the identifier, transmitting to the computing device additional information from the reference database according to the generated association, the additional information being displayable as an overlay in an area proximate to the structured datum simultaneous to the pointer being positioned over the structured datum; and

responsive to receiving the identifier, updating the reference database to track the number of times a pointer is positioned over the structured datum. (emphasis added)

Support for the amendment can be found in the specification as filed, for example, from page 7, line 1 to line 17, and Figure 7. Independent claim 21 has been amended to now

recite a method that augments a source data file *at a first instance*, receives an identifier *at a second instance* that corresponds to a pointer being placed over an augmented structured datum in the augmented data file, transmits additional information that can be displayed as an overlay of the augmented data file, and updates a reference database to track the number of times a pointer is positioned over the structured datum.

The claimed feature advantageously tracks the number of times a pointer is positioned over the structured datum responsive to receiving the identifier so that real-time statistical data of user activity may be obtained. Furthermore, as viewers move pointers over the structured datum of an augmented data file, the claimed method transmits additional information from the reference database that simultaneously displays with the structured datum. As a result, the viewers are viewing the latest information in the reference database associated with the structured datum along with the augmented data file in the same browsing window. In addition, the viewer only needs to *move* the pointer over the structured datum to view the additional information rather than having to “click” a hyperlink. Likewise, amended independent claims 1, 30, 41, 52 and 63 recite features similar to claim 21.

Walker, among other differences, does not disclose the claimed limitation of updating a reference database to track the number of times a pointer is positioned over a structured datum responding to receiving an identifier. Rather, Walker discloses a method that merely incorporates hyperlinks into electronic files from a preference database based on the content of the files, and present viewers with the files along with the incorporated hyperlinks. (Walker, page 16, lines 10-26). With the hyperlink already included in the file, there is no need in Walker to track the number of times the pointer is positioned over it. Therefore, Walker fails to disclose updating the reference database to track the number of times a

pointer is positioned over the structured datum as required by amended independent claims 1, 21, 30, 41, 52 and 63.

Further, Walker fails to disclose transmitting additional information displayable as an overlay of the augmented data file responding to a pointer being positioned over a structured datum. In Walker, in order to view the additional information associated with the incorporated hyperlinks, a viewer must *click* the hyperlinks in order to have that information transmitted to the viewer. This approach is different than simply *moving* the pointer over the structured datum (and doing nothing more) in order to automatically have the additional information pushed to the file. In the former case (clicking a hyperlink), the associated data file is displayed in a new browsing window or the current browsing window only after the link is affirmatively selected. (Walker, page 19 (labeled page number 18), lines 26-28, and page 51, lines 7-10 (After user click a hyperlink, browser displays the associated web page)). In contrast to Walker, the claimed approach of moving the pointer over the structured datum causes “the additional information [to be displayed] as an overlay in an area proximate to the structured datum” in the current browsing window *together* with the augmented data file when the pointer is positioned over the structured datum. This latter approach does not require any other affirmative action for selection and does not require opening a new browsing window.

Examiner’s references page 32, line 26 – page 33, line 2 and page 37, line 29 – page 39, line 13 of Walker for teaching of the claimed element of transmitting additional information responding to a pointer being positioned over a structured datum. However, the cited section of Walker only discloses displaying a hyperlink in a balloon window that emerges when the user places a pointer over a data pattern in a file. The hyperlink exits in

the web page *before* the pointer is placed over the data pattern and must be clicked in order to receive additional information. Thus, in Walker no additional information displayable as an overlay is transmitted as a result of the pointer being placed over the data pattern.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit Walker fails to disclose each and every limitation recited in amended independent claim 21 (and, in turn, also claims 1, 30, 41, 52 and 63). Thus, amended independent claims 1, 21, 30, 41, 52 and 63 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Further, the dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102 rejections is respectfully requested.

**Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Walker and Skillen**

In the 7th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 16, 39, 40, 50, 51, 61 and 78 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Walker and U.S. Patent No. 6,098,065 to Skillen et al. (“Skillen”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, Walker fails to disclose each and every limitation of amended independent claims 1, 21, 30, 41, 52 and 63. However, Skillen does not remedy the deficiencies of Walker. Skillen discloses a method of providing desired information to a user searching for desired information within a data network. The method is Skillen consists of receiving search request from the user, searching in the data network, and providing the result back to the user. (Skillen, col. 1, lines 37-67, col. 2, lines 1-10). Skillen is silent as to transmitting additional information displayable as an overlay of the augmented data file responding a pointer being positioned over a structured datum and updating a database to track the number of times a pointer is positioned over the structured datum. Accordingly,

like Walker, Skillen also fails to at least disclose at least one claimed feature of independent claims 1, 21, 30, 41, 52 and 63.

In view of the above, Walker and Skillen, whether considered individually or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in amended independent claims 1, 21, 30, 41, 52 and 63. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 21, 30, 41, 52 and 63 are patentable over Walker and Skillen. The dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-82, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Douglas Stevenson and Craig Allen Gooding

Date: January 29, 2007

By: /Rajiv P. Patel/

Rajiv P. Patel, Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 39,327  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7607  
Fax: (650) 938-5200